

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلُهُ عَلَى سُلُوكِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

RABĪ' 'UT-THĀNĪ 1347 A.H.

VOL. XVI.

OCTOBER, 1928 A.C.

No. 10

NOTES

Milādu 'n-Nabī in London.

On Saturday, September 8, 1928, at 8 p.m., the members of the British Muslim Society, together with their guests and friends, assembled at Stewart's Restaurant, Old Bond Street, to celebrate the Birthday of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The Birthday this year fell, in fact, on August 27th, but the reason for the discrepancy as to the date will be readily appreciated if we remember that, apart from the fact that the Birthday in itself is a great occasion, the Society has always regarded the commemoration of the event as one of the means to the end for which it came into existence; that is to say, the propagation of Islam. In Europe, such an epoch-making occasion can appositely be used as a vehicle for spreading the truth about Islam and its great founder; and, inasmuch as the holiday season is in full swing during the month of August, in order to avoid defeating the main purpose of the commemoration the Society deemed it inexpedient to adhere strictly to the exact date.

The arrangements for the evening were in the hands of the Executive Committee, whose wide propaganda and zealous efforts were rewarded with a striking measure of success. This year a record gathering of about three hundred assembled

ISLAMIC REVIEW

to pay homage to the glorious memory of the Prophet. The one chief feature worthy of note, and matter indeed for pride and thankfulness, was the presence of not a few Hindu friends—a healthy sign of the times—who came to participate in the celebrations. We fervently pray that Muslims as well as Hindus realized then that reverence for noble natures and for the great religious personages of both the great sister communities of India is the one right basis for friendship. Is it too much to hope that, in this matter, we may have instituted a precedent to be followed presently in India on a vaster scale?

Lord Headley, the President of the Society, was in the chair, while Mr. Habeebu 'llah Lovegrove, the Secretary, Mr. M. Yosrī, of Cairo, the Joint Secretary, and Mr. M. A. Majid, M.A., the Acting-Imām of the Mosque, Woking, occupied seats on the platform. Professor Léon, the Vice-President of the Society, who had been away in Egypt for reasons of health, was also present.

The meeting opened with a recitation from the Qur-án by Mr. M. Yosrī. He was followed by Lord Headley, who translated the verses for the benefit of the English audience. The Chairman, in his presidential remarks, expressed his overwhelming sense of gratitude for the munificence of His Exalted Highness the Nizām of Hyderabad Deccan, who has, as our readers already know, most generously presented the sum of £54,000, thus enabling him to realize his long-cherished dream of a Muslim Mosque in the heart of London. He announced amidst cheers that the site for the Mosque had been chosen, and further pointed out that of the many effective methods of propaganda, or at least of arousing public interest and calling attention to Islam and what it stands for, the most effective of all was to erect a suitable Mosque worthy of our great religion. He regretted that certain ill-meaning persons were busy spreading false rumours, which were intended to cast doubts on both his (the speaker's) own integrity and on that of his friend and colleague, Khwaja Kamālu 'd-Dīn.

Professor Léon gave a brief sketch of the life of the Prophet, and drew special attention to the consoling and soothing part

in that life played by the lady Khadija. Then followed a reverent silence when Mr. Samāha, an Egyptian gentleman, recited an Arabic ode. He was followed by Mr. 'Abdu 'l-Ghanī Chaudrī, formerly editor of the *Khilāfat* (daily), Bombay, who in a short speech gave our spiritualistic friends much food for thought. He laid stress on the idea that the reality of the present-day vast Islamic Brotherhood was the outcome of the thought-force of the Holy Prophet Muhammad who, fourteen hundred years ago, welded the warring and ignorant tribes of Arabia into an everlasting brotherhood that has rendered unique service in the building up of a new civilization. Further, he remarked that spirit messages were being received to the effect that Islam was the religion of the future; and, later, he entertained the audience with an Urdū ode, sung in praise of the Holy Prophet, with piano accompaniment played by himself, which was greatly appreciated by those present. Then came Mr. A. K. Pavitran, a Hindu gentleman from Madras, India, who had expressed a desire to say a few words on the subject of the Prophet and his work, to whose everlasting memory the Muslim Brotherhood was a wonderful living monument. He pointed out that although all religions preached the conception of a universal brotherhood, yet it was in Islam, and Islam alone, that it had materialized. The gathering appreciated this unique addition to the chorus of praise which had gone forth from the meeting.

The Secretary, with a store of energy reserved for Islam in his advanced years, rose to submit a sketch of the British Muslim Society and the progress it had so far attained, enlivening his remarks with many flashes of his characteristic wit.

The gathering then adjourned for refreshment, after proceedings of unusual interest which lasted over two hours.

The Ordinand and the Book of Common Prayer.

An article entitled "A Vital Question," which appears in the *English Churchman and St. James's Chronicle* for September 6, 1928, displays a line of argument both interesting and admirable. It is interesting because it has the courage to bolster up those doctrines which are now generally admitted

ISLAMIC REVIEW

to be effete and hopelessly behind the times; and it is admirable in that it has so far the courage of its conviction as lightly to brush aside the scruples of candidates for ordination, each of whom is supposed to have studied the history of the compilation of the Bible. For these reasons we feel irresistibly impelled to somewhat lengthy quotation. Our contemporary, for example, commenting on the question contained in the Service for the Ordination of Deacons, which reads : " Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments?" and the answer thereto being " I do believe," says :—

Now this question, though brief, is remarkably comprehensive, and it is of vital import. When we consider it, we see what it excludes. It leaves no place for the theory which would discriminate between one part of the Bible and another, pronouncing the one as reliable and the other as unworthy of belief. It will not allow the idea that men may divide the Canon into sections and describe some as the proper and others as the improper objects of Christian faith. It deals with the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments as forming an integral whole. Secondly, it excludes the subjective speculations and unproved notions which pass current under the name of Higher Criticism. Those who framed the question had a very different conception of the Canonical Scriptures from the patchwork collection of merely human productions, and even myths and forgeries, which the higher critics would give us in motley measure according to their various fancies and whims. Thirdly, the question and answer designedly shut out all possibility of pretence or mental reservation; unfeigned faith is demanded and unfeigned faith is declared.

And fourthly, this question excludes apocryphal literature of every kind, even that which has often been bound up within the covers of the Bible. More particularly, it eliminates those books associated with the Old Testament, and commonly known as the Apocrypha, to which the Church of Rome accords the character of genuine Scripture. Of them the Sixth Article says that the Church " doth read them for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine." They are not in the same category, and they do not make the same demand upon a Christian's faith, as the Canonical Scriptures.

This question, as everyone knows, has often proved itself to be an embarrassing one, and the revisers of the Book of Common Prayer proposed to substitute for it the following:—

Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as given of God to convey to us in many

parts and in divers manners the revelation of Himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ? *Answer:* I do.

Our contemporary is happy at the rejection of the Deposited Prayer Book, because the "qualifying statement

added on to the original was intended to relieve ordinands from the obligation of professing faith in the whole Bible. They might give the affirmative answer provided for them, while holding that portions of the Canonical Scriptures were more or less untrue. The refusal to credit, or the definite repudiation of, parts of the inspired Word would be no hindrance to their becoming pastors and teachers in the National Church. Indeed, when we look into the matter, we see that it leaves out of count that large portion of the Divine revelation which is occupied with the origin and history of mankind upon this earth. *It would be possible for a man to assent to the question without affirming his faith in the Biblical records of the creation, the fall, the flood and many points in the patriarchal and Israelitish history. It would be possible for him to make the same assent, and yet to deny that many of the miracles to which the Scriptures testify ever occurred. Nay, more, the very form of the question seems to invite him to exclude from his credenda whatever is not covered by the added qualification.*¹ And in this connection we are bound to notice the course pursued by the revisers in other sections of the Prayer Book. They found distinct references, implying honest belief, to the creation of Adam and Eve and their primitive innocence; to their fall and its resulting effect on the human race; to the Flood and the deliverance of Noah and his family by means of the ark; and to the patriarchal history; and they deliberately deleted these references in deference to the sceptical views which the Modernists hold and profess. They also attempted the expurgation of the Psalms, on the theory that it is for men to judge the Holy Scriptures and decide what is to be regarded as profitable and unprofitable. All this shows a grave departure from the conception of the Bible which was held by believers of every age down to quite recent times. Many of our Bishops, Deans, Canons, theological professors, principals of colleges, and other leaders now take up and repeat the suggestions and arguments of unbelief propounded by sceptics in previous generations.

Small wonder that the dearth of clergy is making itself so keenly felt at the present juncture.

The Ostrich Policy Incarnate.

Having read the article, excerpts from which we have given above, we were straightway reminded of a well-known, if somewhat hackneyed, Persian couplet—*Gar hamīn maktab ast hamīn Mulla Kār-i-tiflān tamām Khwāhad shud* (which, being literally rendered, would run: If such be the school,

¹ Italics are ours.—ED. I.R.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

such the teacher, God help the scholars!) The couplet is believed to have originated on an occasion when a certain nobleman who had gone to pay a visit of inspection to an infant school found, to his amazement, the building dilapidated and neglected, and the teacher incredibly stupid in appearance—not to say half-witted.

With a slight change of words, we could well say: "If such be the Anglican Faith, and such its expositors, God help the ordinands."

It is, no doubt, true that certain very well-marked Rome-ward tendencies were to be found in the Deposited Prayer Book, which, if Parliament's approval had been obtained, would have received the thrice-blessed halo of legal sanction. On this score alone, we are glad that the Deposited Book was rejected. But even so, we were in equal measure grieved when the resolution for its adoption was rejected for the second time; such rejection simply means indefinite delay in the official recognition of the Qur-ānic claim that the compilation of the Bible has been attended by human error,¹ both in accretions and subtractions. This claim was put forward by the Qur-ān fourteen hundred years ago when the "Higher Criticism" was unknown, and when the Bible from cover to cover was looked upon by Christians as having been revealed by God word for word. The truth of the Qur-ānic contention has dawned upon the world, and is now generally regarded as an established fact. Whether Church or Parliament refuse or not to recognize it officially is more or less a matter of indifference. The world knows the truth well enough.

No one nowadays can honestly come forward with the claim that the Bible, word for word in its present state, is the revealed Word of God. This, however, is not the occasion for a discussion of the details of the history of the compilation of the Bible. Suffice it to say that

the earliest Gospel was not compiled until at least seventy years after the birth of Our Lord, while the New Testament as a whole contains material written at various times over a period of perhaps more than

¹ The Holy Qur-ān, ii. 75; iii. 76, 77; iv. 46. References according to Muhammad Ali's Qur-ān (Lahore, 1920).

one hundred years, and that therefore every such question ought first to be dated and textually scrutinized before it is used for historical purposes. No Biblical scholar, of any standing to-day, whether he be clergyman, a minister, or a layman, accepts the entire New Testament as authentic, and all admit that many errors, misunderstandings, and absurdities have crept into the story of Christ's life and other matters. Indeed, it is now generally acknowledged among students that the recognition of these mistakes, far from being the act of a heretic, is the first duty of the intelligent Christian.

The time is past when we could give our adherence to beliefs which have no sound historical¹ foundation and justify ourselves in so doing by saying that the New Testament is the infallible Word of God; for the answer of the critic is simply: "Who says it is?"—to which there is no reply other than a repetition of the statement that such is the Christian belief.²

The case for the Old Testament is still weaker. Apart altogether from the question of textual criticism, a glance at the vicissitudes through which the compilation of the Old Testament had to pass, as recorded by Jewish history, will convince us of the nature of the outrages which must have been committed on the written word.

Now try for a moment to picture the mental condition of an ordinand who, invariably an educated, "intelligent" man, is expected to say "I do believe them" in answer to the question contained in the Service for the Ordination of Deacons, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" Either the ordinand must unlearn what he has learnt, flout and pooh-pooh the researches and labours of every Biblical critic, or he must, the better to delude himself and satisfy the crying calls of conscience, outwardly say "Yes" and inwardly, under his breath, murmur "No." For otherwise there seems to be no loophole through which he may crawl.

Mr. Arthur Weigall says "it is the first duty of the *intelligent* Christian" to recognize the mistakes in the New Testament, but it would be interesting to know what he thinks of all those who have to say "I do believe" to this obsolete question. We are sure that he would, in all candour, be forced to admit that "intelligent" is hardly the word.

¹ Italics are ours.—ED. I.R.

² Arthur Weigall, *Paganism in our Christianity* (London, 1928), pp. 30-31.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Study of Islam and the Sword of Islam.

The world-wide awakening noticeable in all those countries in which Islam is professed as their religion cannot be termed a mere coincidence of events. The evidences of its existence are written too large on the politics of the present day to be brushed aside. Under Mustaphā Kamāl Pāshā, the Turks have turned the tide of the European conquest; under Rezā Shāh Pahlavī, the Persians have shaken off the burden imposed by Britain and Russia; under Ibn Sa'ūd, Arabia has become more nearly a unity than at any time since the days of the great Caliphs; under Amānu 'llāh Khān, Afghānistān has extorted recognition of her independence, and has entered as a kingdom in the comity of nations. In Egypt, Northern Africa, and India the nationalist movement is not new, although it is of late more important. All this marvellous awakening on the one hand, the wonderful achievements of wireless and aviation on the other, the wrangle about the Prayer Book in the religious world of England and spiritual fermentation and unrest marked by profound dissatisfaction with the old ideas and a groping after new ones which are not forthcoming on the third, are some of the phases through which mankind is passing and which are in the forefront of the public eye. These are some of the arresting facts which do call for a study of Islam.

But, on the other hand, one notices that the universal upheaval in the Muslim countries causes, and has caused, feelings of unrest in the Western mind. It sees a danger to the peace of the world in its awakening. It does realize that the presence of Islam must be reckoned with; for it commands the allegiance of about 350 millions of souls.¹ There are many who fail to see why such a thought should not at all be regarded as a figment of frenzied brains. But that is more easily said than done. We have to find the root-cause of this nervousness being exhibited at the awakening of the Muslim world.

To avoid all misunderstanding and to pave the way for a better understanding, we have always advocated that it is

¹ According to Muslim computation.

absolutely essential that a study of Islam be made with dispassion by all Europeans. And as to the importance of such a study, it may be remarked in passing, it cannot well be overrated in the case of Britishers especially. For the destiny of the British Empire, according to some writers, is intertwined with the millions of Muslims in the fellowship of a commonwealth.

We, for our part, believe that the greatest stumbling-blocks in the way of an average European are offered by the considerations of race prejudices and by the false notion that Islam was spread by, and owes its world-wide allegiance to, the point of the sword.

Race-prejudices are self-imagined and self-styled; hence they can be dismissed peremptorily. As to the use of the sword, let us listen to the words of Professor C. H. Becker of the University of Berlin; and this long quotation may be taken as our quota in smoothing the way for a further study of Islam. For we believe once these two questions are settled, the study of Islam will be made more amenable and easier. In his book *Christianity and Islam* (London, 1909), pp. 28-33, he says:—

Muhammad's original view that earlier religions had been founded by God's will and through divine revelation led both him and his successors to make an important concession: adherents of other faiths were not compelled to adopt Islam. They were allowed to observe their own faith unhindered, if they surrendered without fighting, and were even protected against their enemies, in return for which they had to pay tribute to their Muslim masters; this was levied as a kind of poll-tax. . . . It would be incorrect for the most part to regard the warrior bands which started from Arabia as inspired by religious enthusiasm or to attribute to them the fanaticism which *was first aroused*^{*} by the Crusades, and in an even greater degree by the later Turkish wars. . . . *Anti-Christian fanaticism there was, therefore, none.* Even in early years Muhammadans never refused to worship in the same building as Christians. . . . In any case religious animosity was a very subordinate phenomenon. It was a gradual development, and seems to have made a spasmodic beginning in the first century under the influence of ideas adopted from Christianity. *It may seem paradoxical to assert that it was Christian influence which first stirred Islam^{*} to religious animosity* and armed it with the sword against Christianity, but the hypothesis becomes highly probable when we have realized the indifferentism of the Muhammadan conquerors. . . . The attitude

^{*} Italics are ours.—ED. I.R.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

[of the Muslims] towards other beliefs was never so intolerant as was that of Christendom at that period. . . . Moreover, at all times, especially in the first century, the position of Christians has been very tolerable, even though the Muslims regarded them as an inferior class. Christians were able to rise to the highest offices of State, even to the post of Vizier, without compulsion to renounce their faith. Even during the period of the Crusades, when the religious opposition was greatly intensified, *again through Christian policy*,¹ Christian officials cannot have been uncommon: otherwise Muslim theorists can never have uttered constant invectives against the employment of Christians in administrative duties. Naturally, zealots appeared at all times on the Muhammadan as well as on the Christian side, and *occasionally isolated acts of oppression took place: these were, however, exceptional*.¹ So late as the eleventh century, Church funeral processions were able to pass through the streets of Baghdād with all the emblems of Christianity, and disturbances were recorded by the chroniclers as exceptional. In Egypt, Christian festivals were also regarded to some extent as holidays by the Muhammadan population. We have but to imagine these conditions reversed in a Christian kingdom of the early Middle Ages. . . .

. . . The Crusades, the Turkish wars, and the great expansion of Europe widened the gulf between Christianity and Islam, while as the East was gradually brought under ecclesiastical influence the contrast grew deeper. *The theory, however, that the Muhammadan conquerors and their successors were inspired by a fanatical hatred of Christianity is a fiction invented by Christians*.¹

The Other Side of the Picture.

The Kellogg Pact has been signed, and, to go by the chorus of praise in the English Press, it would seem that the world had taken a step forward on the road to everlasting peace. Pulpit and Press alike have been vociferous, although here and there doubts have been expressed as to its success owing to the absence from the text of the Pact of any religious formula.

When all is said and done, it is better to glance at the other side of the picture whereof one side seems of so roseate a hue. Certain idealists have hailed the Pact as inaugurating the Biblical era of the Millennium.

But the *Sphere* for September 1, 1928, publishes a letter from a prominent man of high rank in the Orient, and we think it well worth our readers' while to devote a few moments to its perusal. The letter reads thus :—

In the Kellogg Pact your Christian nations renounce war as an instrument of national policy, and vow to make no more war—among

¹ Italics are ours.—ED. I.R.

NOTES

yourselves! That renunciation and that vow, laid down on paper, in Paris of all places, does not extend to us of other races, colour, and religion. Against us your Christian races do not renounce war, and against us you can and will war without having broken your vow by so doing, in the guise of your reservations "except in defence and of our national interests."

Now you come with a "Kellogg Peace Pact" made in America, as were the Fourteen Points, the Self-Determination of Peoples, and the League of Nations. And just as elusive. For five years France, sheltering under the mantle of the mandate of the League of Nations, smothered in blood the "self-determination" efforts of Syria. Now it has suspended for three months the Syrian National Assembly, which drafted the Constitution for a Free Republic. In Egypt the Constitution has been a "scrap of paper"—with the tacit consent of England, for without that it could not have occurred. Were the Egyptian people to revolt, England, with its troops of occupation, would promptly go to war.

Would Britain hesitate to go to war in India, despite its renunciation and vow in the Kellogg Pact? France is making war against the mountain tribes in Southern Morocco, Italy against the Senussi in the Sahara, and both no doubt feel that their conscience is clear, and that they are not hypocritical. The Kellogg Pact will not inhibit or prevent bombing squadrons throwing bombs on defenceless Arabs on the Irak-Arabia border. Against Moors, Arabs, Egyptians, Syrians, Indians, Persians, Filipinos, and Nicaraguans the Christian nations have not in the American Kellogg Pact vowed before the One God and History to renounce war as an instrument of national policy.

Need we say more?

Muhammad is the "Shiloh."

Professor 'Abdu 'l-Ahad Dáwúd, on his article "Muhammad in the Old Testament: Muhammad is the 'Shiloh,'" which appeared in our September 1928 number, writes:—

"Some time ago I got hold of the Latin version of the Old Testament—the Vulgate—in which I see that St. Jerome has translated the word 'Shiloh,' just as I have preferred to read, as 'Shaloah' or 'Shiloah.' He has translated it as *qui mittendus est*; that is to say, 'the apostle' of or by Allah."

We print this so that our readers may take note of this very important corroboration.

A Correction.

Please read "Judah" for "latter" in line 21, page 314, September 1928 number. We are sorry for this inadvertent error.

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES TO MAN

By DR. MUHAMMAD JA'FAR, M.B.B.S., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.,
D.T.M. and H. (Eng.)

BEFORE dealing with the subject proper it seems reasonable that a few prefatory remarks be made about diet in general. It is recognized on all hands that diet is the most essential factor in the maintenance of physical health. The educated section of people realizes its importance more than ever because of the vitamin theory and the diseases attributed to the absence of the various vitamins. Our lack of knowledge of this important factor up till very recently clearly goes to show that very little attention was paid to diet from the medical point of view. Pure diet combined with personal hygiene and a properly regulated life leads to perfect health. For my part, I think there is no subject so important as the health of an individual, because it is only out of this that a healthy mind and the best intellectual qualities can grow. It is, therefore, quite obvious that we should be most discreet in the selection of our diet than we at present are and have been in the past. I would not here deal with the nutritive value of diet, because as compared with a diseased diet the one of less nutritive value does practically no harm.

Diet varies with countries and communities. And as far as my observations go they are directed against the empirical diet which has been handed down to these communities by their ancestors so that they tenaciously adhere to some of the foods. Some of them, in the majority of cases, are the least nutritious, while there are others which are unhygienic. Moreover, in this advanced age if one were to call people's attention to some of their defects in their daily life, one would find that they would manifest one of the most perplexing absurdities of human nature—they would loathe to give up and discard all that has been sanctified by the hoary usage of the past. And what is more, they would try to justify what is unscientific. In fact, the real idea at the back of their minds is the false justification: "Well, our forefathers have been taking

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES

the same diet, and how could they have lived healthily if the present scientific denunciations of this diet were true?" But if for a moment one applied the same argument to the preventive measures against various other diseases, one would realize the fallacy of this line of argument. Take, for example, the disease called bilharzia,¹ so common in Egypt. Who, until very recently, knew that the young trematode² entered the human body through the skin while bathing in infected water? Although everyone now would dread the infected water, yet what about those who would persist in doing what their forefathers did? They are certainly courting disease. The common house-fly was long regarded as innocuous. But now we know how important it is to keep it away from our food. Right argument is one thing and fanaticism another. I am not guilty of ungenerosity when I say that fanaticism of this sort has been a great hindrance in the advancement of civilization.

Leaving the general public alone for a moment, let us now see how those who ought to have devoted more attention to the matter and considered it more carefully fare in this respect. To our surprise, we find that they are in no way better equipped. For, as a rule, a young qualified practitioner on leaving his institution has to act as guide to his patients in matters of diet and personal hygiene. But the question of questions is if he has at all been fully instructed in this direction. I know from my own experience that questions about diet from his patients are very unpleasant to him and he always tries to get out of this difficulty by making some simple suggestions, made perhaps by someone of his profession on a previous occasion. Why an ordinary medical practitioner is justified in making some vague suggestions is a question which can only be understood if one were to remember that there is an entire absence of this important subject from the medical curriculum, which fact, I must say, is a standing slur on the profession. Every medical practitioner has felt this difficulty, but, even so, it is passing strange to find that to-day

¹ It is a disease due to a certain parasite called schistosomia.

² A class of parasites.

there are very few who take this aspect very seriously. A literature of a very elementary nature has recently been produced, but it can be of little or no use unless all the existing diets have been thoroughly investigated and their advantages and disadvantages widely discussed. For unless this is done it seems almost impossible to add anything to or eliminate from the present schedule of diet.

It is rather surprising to note that while the Arabian medicine deals with the properties of all the edibles, the European medicine omits them altogether, and yet, as remarked by Professor E. G. Browne in his book the *Arabian Medicine*,¹ the latter is an improvement on the former. Besides, in earlier days, the dietetic laws used to form part and parcel of religion. Why it was as such is quite obvious. The primitive human mind in those ages could hardly understand the explanation, but all the same it was to its interest to refrain from some harmful things. The various reformers were persons gifted with certain powers, and they had the insight to discriminate good from bad for the benefit of mankind at large. To-day, when science is advancing with rapid strides, we come to realize the importance of those ideas behind some of the injunctions dealing with edibles.

Till very recently little was known about the veterinary medicine, although a great deal had already been done for human medicine; and with our present knowledge of the former a mighty revolution is making headway in the domains of the latter. The very fact that certain diseases existing in animals are very similar to those found in man and that their causal germs are the same with a little difference of biological characters, leads one to think that there must have been transmission from one to the other. The science of entomology has filled up the gap and accused the various insects for the transference of disease, thus completing the whole chain of events. So nowadays the control of a disease is based either on the elimination of the reservoir—animal host—or of

¹ London 1921. The book shows that the Arabian Medicine was translated into the Greek and allots a special chapter to show the inadequacy of Latin translations.

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES

the transmitter, and either one of these done successfully stamps out the disease completely.

Our diet includes various articles, e.g. vegetables, fats, and meat. I would restrict myself to dealing with meat alone, and specially the meat obtained from the pig.

Meat generally becomes infective in the following ways :—

(1) The animal when slaughtered may be suffering from a certain disease—say typhoid—while the blood remains in the tissues.

(2) The meat may get contaminated after slaughtering by contact with infected material.

(3) The animal flesh may contain cystic ¹ stage of certain parasites, and on being eaten by man these germs are liberated and develop into adult ones in the human body. Here it is that their real life begins. I will explain later what effects they produce.

Now taking the pig as the subject, I will as briefly as possible describe the various diseases transmitted by it, either directly or indirectly. The animal itself, being a pet of one society and an object of despise with another, needs no introduction, for everyone is more or less acquainted with it. It leads a peculiarly filthy life. Human and dairy refuse is its common food, while rolling in mud and living in the dirtiest quarters are ingrained in its nature. In a word, I know of no other domestic animal other than the pig which if, on the one hand, it lives in such a close association with human society, on the other is so unclean in its ways of living.

Pig-eating originally started in China, and was later gradually taken up by other countries. Modern researches have shown that this animal is the transmitter of a large number of diseases to be found in man. I will begin with those diseases which are produced through its close association with human society and pass on to those caused by the actual consumption of its meat.

1. *Dysentery*.—I need not describe the symptoms of this disease, as everyone is pretty familiar with it. I must in passing suggest that the symptoms of the disease are horribly acute

¹ A stage in the life-history of a parasite.

and may end fatally. Unfortunately, there is no specific cure for it. The causal parasite, called *Balantidnii coti*, is a normal inhabitant of the pig's bowels. It is excreted by it in its fæces, and finding the external environment unsuitable for its life, it develops a shell round it which is called cyst. This cyst, containing inside it the living parasite, contaminates man's diet and thereby reaches his bowels. It was in 1856 that Malmston¹ isolated it from man as the cause of acute dysentery and established its relationship to the pig. The Public Health Department in America has been adopting strong measures to stop it, but with little success. Now they have come to the conclusion that the eradication of the disease lies not only in the proper disposal of excreta, but also in the isolation of pigs; for the parasite of dysentery is the normal inhabitant of their bowels. Chandler, in his book on parasitology, says that it is only in pig-raising countries, and where there is too close an association between man and this animal, that this disease exists.²

2. Another parasite of the pig present in the human organism is *Faciolopsis buski*. It is extensively prevalent in China, so much so that 28 per cent. of the patients admitted into Shaohing Hospital³ were suffering from its effects, and out of all others attending the dispensary 5·5 per cent. were infected. This parasite remains latent for a good long time, leading to a gradual anæmic state accompanied with marked debility. Then follow the digestive disorders and a persistent diarrhœa sets in. The whole body then becomes swollen, due to the œdema of tissues lying under the skin. The parasite on leaving the pig infects a water-snail, who in turn infects man, the infection being caused through drinking the infected water.

3. *Hookworm Disease*.—The young worms of this disease enter the human skin by piercing the skin, and cause a peculiar itching called the "ground itch." After travelling through various tissues, they reach the human bowel and start doing

¹ Chandler's *Animal Parasites and Human Disease*, p. 7 (1926).

² *Ibid.*, p. 127 (1926).

³ Goddard, in Chandler, *op. cit.*, p. 229 (1926).

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES

damage. The symptoms which are produced by their presence are a sort of profound anæmia with an irregular fever. Diarrhœa may be the chief complaint. The patient soon gets exhausted and emaciated. In children the proper growth and development is very much hindered and they fall an easy prey to other infections like T.B., etc. Through the wound caused by these parasites in the bowel may enter typhoid germs and lead to an attack of typhoid fever.

The rôle of the pig in this is of an indirect nature. It eats up the human excreta containing eggs of the parasites which develop inside it and hatch into young worms. When these are passed out they are infective to man. This infection is very prevalent in various tropical countries, and the Rockefeller Institution have prepared a film to show to the non-medical masses and the villagers the part that this animal plays in the dissemination of the infection.

4. *Round Worms*.—These are parasites of nine to ten inches in length, and are also called the travelling worms because they go about into various organs and do not stay in one place at all times. If present in the lungs, they may cause pneumonia; and if in the air tube, suffocation; while, in the intestines, intestinal obstruction; acute pancreatitis and jaundice may result. These parasites of man are quite identical with those found in the pig, and Ransom¹ stated that the human and pig parasites are the same species, and he also called attention to this animal, that acts as the disseminator of infection. Once a man is infected, he becomes a source of infection to his community. Whether or not Ransom's view is correct does not lie within the scope of this essay, but there is no doubt that the parasite is absolutely identical, and if there are any differences in character they are probably due to living in a different host.

5. *Endemic Hæmoptysis* (or bleeding from the lungs).—This disease is quite common in China, Japan, Formosa, etc., and is due to a parasite called "paragonimus" which lives in the lungs. The disease was described by Manson in 1880. The very same parasite is a common parasite of pigs and the

¹ Stitt's *Parasitology*.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

epidemiology of the disease in countries where the pig lives in such close association clearly shows that this animal is the reservoir of infection. This disease is, however, absent from countries where the pig is rare. This parasite is the cause of pneumonia in pigs. Patients having this infection suffer from cough with rusty sputum and have many repeated attacks of profuse bleeding from the lungs. The important point is that hitherto no means of killing the parasites in the tissues or expelling them have been found.

6. *Clonorchiasis*.—This peculiar liver disease is due to a parasite called *Clonorchis sinensis* inhabiting the bile passage and the liver. The liver becomes enlarged, attended with severe jaundice, diarrhoea, and emaciation. It may end fatally. This parasite is also found in the bile passage of the pig. The occurrence of the disease in China, Japan, Korea and Southern India again points to the close association of this animal with being the source of infection, and medical science, in spite of its strenuous efforts, has not yet been able to produce any specific treatment for this disease.

7. *Gigantorhynchus gigas* (discovered by Goeze in 1782).¹—This parasite, which is 20 to 30 cm. long, is found in the pig's intestine and is said to occur in man in the south of Russia. This fact was reported by a physician named Lindeman. It attaches itself to the mucous membrane of the small intestines and produces digestive disorders and anæmia.

8. *Meta strongylus apris* (discovered by Gmelin in 1789).—This worm is a parasite of the pig's lungs and is occasionally found in man. It is a short and slender parasite, and its presence in the lungs may lead to bronchitis, pneumonia, abscess of the lungs, and generalized secondary infection due to other bacteria.

9. *Gastro discoideus hominis* (discovered by Lewis and MacConnel in 1876).—The habitat of this parasite is the lower part of the human bowel. The normal host is pig in Cochinchina,² and it is not yet known what disease it produces in man.

¹ Dumaso Rivas, *Human Parasitology*, p. 338 (1920).

² Milton J. Rosenau, *Preventive Medicine*, p. 746 (1927).

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES

10. *Swine Erysipelas*.—This may occasionally be contracted while handling these animals, and has the same course of inflammation of skin and constitutional disturbances as in ordinary erysipelas, as fever, etc.

11. *Tuberculosis*.—The disease needs no description, as its ravages are known to everyone. It is a common disease of pigs, and is getting more and more common in them. The United States Statistics¹ show that in 1924, 100,110 swine were condemned for this disease, and there were besides those that were infected but not brought up for slaughtering. The disease is conveyed to man by eating infected pork, and there is no doubt that many of the cases of tuberculosis in pig-raising countries can be traced to this source.

12. *Variola suilla* (or swine pox) is a very contagious disease which is sometimes contracted from the pig. It has a fairly high mortality.²

13. *Tapeworm* (pork tapeworm).—This worm is found only in pork-eaters, because of its peculiar life cycle. There are three stages: (1) The egg; (2) cysticercus (occurring in infected pork); (3) the adult parasite in man. When the egg is passed out in human excreta, it is taken up by the hog with its food, which it generally takes from dirty places. Inside its bowel the egg-shell gets dissolved and an embryo is set free. This then travels to its muscles, and lives there in the second stage as cysticercus. Now when pork containing this cysticercus is eaten by man, the young dormant worm is set free and develops into an adult one. It attains a length of six to ten feet and attaches itself to the intestinal wall by means of a crown of hooks at its head. Patients harbouring this parasite continue passing a few of its segments full of eggs at intervals and infect the pigs, whose flesh in turn infects man, but the pig is the most essential chain in the life-cycle, and if this could be eliminated man would practically be free from this infection.

The symptoms which this disease produces may be imagined

¹ Milton J. Rosenau, *Preventive Medicine*, p. 746.

² W. M. Cameron, M.A., Ph.D., M.R.C.V.S., *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1924, vol. xvii, Section "Comparative Medicine," pp. 31-36.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

from the very size of the worm. It is loathsome and repugnant enough to imagine that one has a snake-like thing of such a length wriggling about inside one's bowels. In the case of sensitive patients the knowledge that they have such a thing inside them leads to an extreme degree of depression, and may lead to melancholia. And what is more, this big parasite shares the nourishment of its host (man), thus starving him down and producing certain poisons in turn which have a very deleterious influence on the various systems. Diarrhœa and other digestive disturbances are only too common, anæmia quite marked, and these people remain in a state of chronic invalidism till some intercurrent disease comes to make short work of them.

14. *Trichiniasis*.—This is another disease contracted solely through eating infected pork. The young worms live in the flesh of swine in small cysts, and these cysts may be so small as to be overlooked even by the microscope. When such meat is eaten, these worms are liberated and develop quickly into the adult male and female worms, which very rapidly multiply, leading to a host of young generation which leaves the human bowel and travels by way of the blood to the muscles of man. The young trichina worms in the cysts have a very long life, and even after the animal has been slaughtered they remain alive for a very long time if the meat is preserved.

The symptoms of the disease produced may be an acute abdominal pain and diarrhœa while they are in the intestine. This leads to an extreme degree of weakness and a twitching of the various muscles. The face becomes puffy and the eyelids swollen. Then comes the stage of fever like typhoid, and at this stage the young generation is going about in the blood trying to settle in some of its host's muscles. When they reach the muscles, they lead to intense rheumatic and muscular pains. Breathing may be interfered with and some cases actually develop asthma. The skin develops a rash, and if the stress falls on the lungs it leads to pneumonia. It may be fatal in this stage, and the mortality has been as high as 30 per cent. of the infected cases. The meat inspection as a safeguard against this has so far proved quite inefficacious.

PIG AS THE TRANSMITTER OF DISEASES

Even the microscope has failed. This fact may be illustrated by a statement by Milton J. Rosenau in his book on *Preventive Medicine*. He says :¹ " No method of inspection has yet been devised by which the presence or absence of trichina in pork can be determined with certainty, and the Government meat inspection does not include inspection for this parasite. All persons are accordingly warned not to eat pork or sausage, whether it has been officially inspected or not, until after it has been properly cooked." But as far as the standard of cooking is concerned it is very difficult to know at what temperature it dies. Roasting certainly does not kill it. The process of curing raw ham by saltpetre kills only those larvæ which are lying superficially ; those in the deeper layers always escape. Smoke is used for curing in Westphalia, but it certainly has no effect on the trichina. The disease is never recognized in the living swine, and even in the dead one the inspection is unsatisfactory. Out of 6,329 cases of this disease in man which occurred in Germany 32 per cent. were traced to meat which had been inspected as being free from trichina.²

From the above-mentioned diseases in man which have been known up to this time to have their origin in the pig, one can imagine how absolutely essential it is to be on our guard against this animal. The rat transmits one disease—plague—and we are always after its extermination. Why should we not, then, direct our attention to the pig as well? From time immemorial its elimination from society has been suggested, but such a suggestion emanated from the religious reformers. Time was when religion alone ruled the world, but those days are gone never to return. At every step there seems to arise a clash between religion and science, especially if the principles laid down by the former fall short of the researches of the latter. Both Moses³ and Muhammad⁴ prohibited the use of this animal's flesh because they knew that it was the source of disease. Islam appeared on the stage of this world proclaiming from the housetops that there is nothing in its principles which science could upset or falsify

¹ P. 755. ² Milton J. Rosenau, *Preventive Medicine*, p. 755.

³ Lev. xi. 7. ⁴ Qurán, v. 3. Muhammad Ali's Qurán (Lahore, 1920).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

even in its present advanced stage. If only people would look at them with unbiased minds they would find that the recent scientific advances and researches in various directions have gone to confirm the validity of its principles. Alcohol is a case in point. Teetotalism was applauded in the Western countries, and now it is that we find that regular societies are forming to put an end to its consumption. Did not Islam enjoin upon its followers their complete abstinence from it fourteen hundred years ago?

Science has started to take interest in animal disease only very recently, and it is only in the last few years that the doctors and the veterinary physicians have come into closer contact. The original idea of prevention of disease with reference to these animals was started by Pasteur, and it is perfectly true that no prophylaxis—preventive methods—can be successful unless the real reservoir of the disease is destroyed or rendered free from disease.

THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDERS

By R. LISSAN

THE Sacrament of Holy Orders or Ordination, which is the last of seven sacraments,¹ is supposed to confer grace and fitness to fulfil the office of priest in the Church, as leader, instructor and guide.

It is held that Jesus founded a ministry to be a means of bestowing grace on the Church and for its government. For this purpose he founded an Apostolate and gave it a commission apart from the Church at large. Others have taken a different view, such as Hatch, in his work *Organization of the Early Christians*, and Hort, in *The Christian Ecclesia*, who say that the commission was given to the Church as a whole, and that the Church appointed the Apostles, who were commissioned by Jesus as the witnesses of his resurrection.

¹ Nos. 1 to 6 have been dealt with in previous numbers of the *Islamic Review*.—Ed. I.R.

THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDERS

By the term "ordination" is meant the manner of admission of persons to ministerial office in the Christian Church. It should be understood that the liturgical or ceremonial and ritual sides are distinct from the spiritual and the peculiar fitness for this office and cannot be put into terms of outward show. This is apparent when we contemplate the history and lives of the Vicars of Christ and their deputies, the successors of Peter being supposed to be the Rock upon which the Church was built, and the frauds, pious and otherwise, which have added so much lustre to her rule.

For the first six centuries the phraseology and nomenclature of the terms used to describe the ministry were somewhat elastic, and in the succeeding ages there was no fixed terminology in ordination. The early Christian ministry in the apostolic age and the Epistles of the New Testament are of two kinds or classes, namely, itinerant and local.

The itinerant ministry included apostles, prophets and evangelists; the qualification of an apostle seems to have been originally one who had seen Jesus and to have been his "witness." Apostles and prophets were classed together by some, and kept distinct by others. Evangelists are differently grouped and functioned. They had not the qualifications of the apostles, but occupied the first place among the successors of the apostles as itinerant or travelling; the term "pastor" seems to have been indicative of local ministry.

The function of the itinerant ministry was evangelical; they might settle for a time at a place for the purpose of founding churches, and it is probable that from this use and custom sprang the missionary activities of the religious orders and preaching friars.

The local ministry included bishops, presbyters and deacons, whose functions were administrative and pastoral; they were probably entrusted with the conferring of the rites of the Church.

In the Apostolic age, bishops seem to have been the same as presbyters, for a comparison of Acts xx. 17 and xx. 28, where the same people are called by both names, is evident; there are other texts which corroborate this idea. The word

ISLAMIC REVIEW

“presbyter” was probably taken by the Christians from the Jews, who gave this title to the members of the Sanhedrin and others. Inscriptions show that the non-Christian Greeks used it for members of a corporation, and the same thing occurs in the papyri. Neither of the terms, “bishop” or “presbyter,” is of Christian origin or foundation. In Egypt pagan priests were called presbyters (it may also be added that the term “episcopos” was used for certain officials in Greek-speaking countries in pre-Christian times, cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 230). In the early Church the name “presbyter” was specially used, as it would seem, at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30; xv. 2; xvi. 4, etc.), but it was also used by Christian Jews of the dispersion and in Gentile communities, for Paul and Barnabas appointed “elders” in every Church on a journey in Asia Minor.

The identity of bishops and presbyters was completely forgotten before the end of the second century. Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria were unaware of the identity; the latter speaks of commands given in Holy Scripture to presbyters, bishops, deacons, as distinct persons. In the fourth century Jerome and others had learned that bishops and presbyters were the same person. There is one thing noticeable in the terms used in the early Christian ministry, and that is their elasticity of application. The terms “bishop,” “priest,” “deacon,” “high-priest” and “presbyter” seem to have been used promiscuously, for in Hebrews (iii. 1; v. 5; vii. 17, 26; x. 21) Jesus is called a priest. There was apparently an indistinct knowledge in formulating the Church as to the various cognomens and titles drawn and adopted from the non-Christian religious systems.

In the *Epistle of Ignatius* (A.D. 110) we find bishops, in the sense of the word, fully established, the presbyters being allotted to the bishops as councillors, and deacons acting as subsidiary to the presbyters, and a sort of hierarchy was established as follows: Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Sub-deacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, Readers, Door-keepers, Widows.

At Neo-Cæsaria it was enacted that no one could be ordained before thirty years of age, because it was then that Jesus

THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDERS

began to teach, the minimum age for a deacon being twenty-five. Following this, in about the fourth century, we find supervisory offices founded, such as Metropolitan, Patriarch, Archbishop, Chorepiscopi and Archdeacon, some of which belong to the Eastern sects and rites.

As far as the lesser offices were concerned, all were not considered as orders, but were outside. The minor orders were Readers, Sub-deacons, Acolytes, Singers, Interpreters, Door-keepers and Exorcists. In the question of women, it is not easy to distinguish between widows, who were on relief and those who were in the ministry.

The term "ordination" did not necessarily imply the laying-on of hands; election sometimes took place by a show of hands. In later times a difference was made between the consecration of a bishop and the simple ordination of the other orders, but no distinction can be found in the earlier period or known in the East to-day.

In the whole of the early period, ordinations to every grade were simple, consisting of a prayer (usually a single one) and the laying-on of hands. In the New Testament, the imposition of hands at ordination is mentioned (Acts vi. 6); it was accompanied by prayer (Acts xiv. 23). After the Apostolic age we have no mention until the fourth century, when they are plentiful. The Church orders, even where several of them do not give the form used in the eucharistic liturgy, give ordination prayers. In the manuals and books the laying-on of hands is emphasized in the ordination of bishops, presbyters and deacons, and in one or two of them, that of the minor orders, but usually they do not have the ceremony.

In the ordination of a bishop there is a variety of usage as to the part taken by the assisting bishops, of which there were usually three. It must be observed that in the ordination of bishops and presbyters there is no mention of the imperative formula like "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" such as we find in mediæval and modern books in the West.

It is one of the misfortunes of the student of Christian origins that so little is known of the Roman liturgical customs of the early ages. We know next to nothing of ordinations in

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Rome before the sixth century. Then we are given the customs in Rome before the reforms of Gregory the Great. It has ordination prayers for bishops, presbyters and deacons, but not below; their simplicity is their principal characteristic.

In the intermediate period in the West the Roman rite was modified somewhat by the Gallican influence, which differed somewhat. From the seventh to the ninth centuries a process of fusion of the two rites went on and the Gallican consecration prayers were prefixed as rubrics. It was then that the delivery of badges was introduced, to bishops, presbyters and deacons as well as minor orders, the bishop receiving a ring and staff, presbyter a chalice and paten, deacon the Gospel book. The Celtic rite prevailing in England differed from the above-mentioned rite in minor particulars of ordination ritual.

But pre-Reformation, later, ordinations agree with the Roman ceremonial, and in the consecration of a bishop it consisted of prayer, hymn, anointing on head, followed by blessing and the putting on of gloves (in some form) and the receipt of staff, ring and mitre with a blessing. The ordinations to minor orders differed somewhat from that of a bishop.

Subsequent to the Reformation, in the Anglican Church there are no minor orders recognized in the formularies. In the consecration of a bishop it must take place on a Sunday or holy day, after Mattins (morning prayer), during the Eucharist. The oath of the King's supremacy and the oath of canonical obedience to the archbishop are taken; the archbishop and bishops lay hands on the candidate for consecration; prayers are said. The presbyter ordination is simpler, consisting of prayers, litany, exhortations, laying-on of hands, the giving of a Bible, while the Eucharist ceremony proceeds.

In the diaconal ordination, litany, collect and epistle are read, the Eucharistic celebration goes on, and the bishop lays hands on the newly appointed. These Anglican ordinations and consecration are based on the pre-Reformation usages, but are much simplified.

In various rites outside the Anglican and Roman with which we have dealt are found modified and distinct customs and

THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDERS

usages, such as Scandinavian, German Reformed, Græco-Russian, Armenian, Coptic and Maronite, in some of which the ceremonial is ornate and elaborate.

We have seen that the sacraments—confirmation, the Eucharist, etc.—are pre-Christian. Now we shall show this ordination ceremony is derived through Jewish channels from so-called heathen sources.

In Hebrew there are two words meaning ordination; one was used for a few centuries only, the other goes back to Biblical precedent, and is still retained. The Jewish ordination does not partake of a sacerdotal or sacramental character; it is mainly an appointment, but is not devoid of spiritual significance. This takes us back to the time of the Judges of Israel, who administered the Law, both temporal and spiritual. It is rather obscure, for it marks the division between State and Church, which could not have been sharp and decisive, but gradual. Jewish law is not civil but divine ordinance. To obey the law is a religious act; to transgress it, is sin, which has to be explained in a religious manner. The character of the judge could not be that of a mere civil authority. The priestly functions of the Temple belonged to a family; the priest was born. He could not be appointed or ordained.

There was a difference between the priestly ordination of Aaron and the case of the appointment of Joshua and the seventy elders; the former were anointed, while the latter were not. In the case of Joshua it implied a transfer of personal responsibility either in the exercise of authority or in the expiation of sin and guilt, as was done by the priest (Lev. i. 4). There evidently was the appointment of Joshua as civil administrator of the law, the supreme judge, the king; this required no anointing, but simply an appointment. The blemishes which, according to Mosaic ritual, were a barrier to the priest acting in the Temple were not a ban to a judge.

Here we find a separation between the civil and priestly powers, but later Samuel seems to have acted as both priest and king. In later times, after the return from exile, the Jews adopted the custom of uniting the office of high-priest and administrator. Conflict arose, the laymen gained

ISLAMIC REVIEW

supremacy and the Sanhedrin claimed the continuity of succession from Joshua; the high-priest had a seat in it, was consulted and regarded with veneration. This brings us down to about the time of the Christian era, when Roman Christianity arose and the Gospels were formed, with the claim to power said to have been given by Jesus to Peter, and its assumption of civil and priestly power after the fall of the Roman Empire, developing the idea of spiritual and temporal supremacy which was used so ruthlessly in Europe and South America; in Europe it was used in crowning and removing kings and disposing of kingdoms and claiming all power in heaven and earth, without either spirituality or wisdom, in spite of their "infallibility."

The idea of a priesthood or the qualifications to form a link between man and the Creator goes back into the beginnings of savage life and is as old as mankind itself and the beginning of religious belief and magical practices. Hence the rise of priests and magicians who claimed to be able to act as mediators and guides and give advice as to worship. This idea evolves through animism, ancestor-worship (Japanese), or clan-grouping to patriarchal and king-priestly government (Egypt). Progress was long and slow before the latter stages were reached.

Different practices and customs are connected with the priesthood as the scheme develops, such as asceticism, celibacy, ritual fasting or regulation of diet, costume, etc. It does not appear to have been a far stretch from a priest to a sorcerer, medicine-man or rain-maker. The Assyrian priests were tonsured and consecrated, just as the Catholic monks and priests are now. Almost every cultured nation of antiquity had an elaborate system of ritual, liturgy, ceremonial and dress, perhaps none more so than that of ancient Egypt, whence the Jewish (Mosaic code) and, by secondary derivation, the Christian, with symbolism, ceremonial and beliefs, conception of deity forms of the Madonna and Child, have without a shadow of doubt been derived.

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM¹

By DR. GUSTAV DIERCKS

(Translated from the German by 'Abdu 'l-Majid, M.A.)

(Continued from the September number, p. 344.)

It is after that time that the settled Arabs begin to take part as traders in the trade of the world. Through this means they exercised a great influence no less on the conditions of the means of communication than on the culture of the then known world, for it was the Arabs who brought in their merchandise many of the most prized articles of luxury, which they exchanged in great quantities for iron, silver, and Phœnician goods. According to the reports of the ancients, especially according to the geography of Ptolemy, Sprenger is inclined to believe that the well-known Ophir of the Bible (which book, as a matter of fact, gives much information on the Arabs) lies on the west coast of Arabia on the Red Sea.

In the centuries immediately before and after the birth of Christ there appeared Arabs, as already remarked, as soldiers of the parties fighting on the western part of Asia, and Zenobia could create through their help the brilliant Tadmor or Palmyra, and was able to found a kingdom which for a short time rose to such power as to rival the all-powerful Rome. Since A.D. 267, when Palmyra was razed to the ground, down to the times of Muhammad, the Arabs disappear from the historical platform of the world, and their own interior history is so much interwoven with fables and fictions that we cannot form a clear picture of the historical events in Arabia. The fact that the tribes of the peninsula were always on the move, and at feuds with one another, helped to bring the psychical and physical powers and the capabilities of the Bedouins to a still further development. To go into the details of these small wars would be outside the scope of this essay; we would therefore confine ourselves only to the indications of some of the few historical facts which are of importance for the history of Islam.

¹ Being the translation of Gustav Diercks' *Die Araber im Mittelalter und ihr Einfluss auf die Kultur Europa's*. Leipzig, 1882, pp. 39-44.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Mecca has been regarded at all times as a national sacred place, and its foundation, as well as that of its temple, the Ka'ba, was attributed to Abraham and Ishmael. Around the history of the foundation of this town, which repeatedly has been ascribed to the Amalekites, there had arisen many traditions connected with it, because Mecca (the Macoraba of Ptolemy), being an independent, rich, commercial town, and also a religious centre, enjoyed on the whole a great respect, and it appears that many wars took place for the capture of this town. Even in the days of Ishmael, the south Arabian or Yoktanid tribes (amongst which the Jurhamids were the most prominent) are said to have taken possession of the town, which was exposed to the influences of the northern Kindites or Minairs who had built cultural states. About 150 B.C. the flourishing countries of the settled Yoktanid tribes in the south of the peninsula were destroyed through the deluges which drove the people to emigrate. A party of the latter, the Khuzaites, led by one 'Amr bin Lohai, turned themselves northwards towards Mecca and, aided by the Ishmaelites, succeeded in expelling the ruling Jurhamites. But the Ishmaelites endeavoured in their own place to drive out the Khuzaites and to make themselves the owners once more of their original property. But in this they did not succeed. They did, however, acquire the temple service, which was accordingly entrusted to them, especially to the tribe of the Quraish, so that they were empowered to arrange the ritual and the cults and to fix the festival. They could also for the most part fix at their discretion one of the four sacred months, in which every kind of feud must cease throughout the whole of the peninsula. Through this office they acquired not only a prominent prestige, but also an influence over the whole of the Arabian population. It was about the middle of the fifth century after Christ, in the year 464, that the Quraishites succeeded in driving out the Khuzaites and in wresting from them the possession of Mecca for themselves. In the meantime Mosaism and Christianity had gained many followers in the south and west of Arabia, and the wars which resulted, especially the Christian persecutions which broke out

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM

in Yeman about the end of the fifth century in consequence of the predominance of Mosaism, served as an incentive for the Christian Ethiopian emperor to conquer Southern Arabia, to capture Mecca itself in A.D. 571 and to rule those territories till about A.D. 576, in which year, in order to avoid measuring his power with that of the Persian Chosroes I, he retreated back to Ethiopia.

To the Bedouin, who starts with the principle of individual equality, the monarchist form of organization was out of the question. Each family constituted in itself a small and absolutely independent state, whose leader was either the oldest of the family or that one who was most distinguished both for mental capacity and for valour. When families grew into tribes, there arose, as against other tribes, the necessity for tribal leadership, whether in war or on the occasion of the great festivals. Here, again, it was the oldest member of the tribe, or that one who was generally recognized as most capable, whom the leaders of the families elected as Shaikh from amongst themselves. So far was the chieftain thus elected from becoming a prince, that it was not even within his power to make any rule or regulation whatsoever, unless the same duly emanated from a common resolution unanimously adopted by the heads of the families. To the chieftain was accorded no higher personal power than that enjoyed by every other member of the tribe. The most that was done was that his advice was followed; there was no question of his behests being obeyed. There are many examples to show that this patriarchal constitution was preserved—which is exactly what happened in the case of the settled Arabs—even when greater state organisms were created, with kings at the helm. In the first place, an inheritance of the rank of a king was a virtual impossibility, more especially so when we remember that there was no talk of what we now term a “nobility” amongst the Arabs. Moreover, the power of the princes was not only extremely limited, but depended upon the good will of the shaikhs or the electors, and was only tolerated so long as it was in consonance with the old time-honoured and traditional customs. Independent of the shaikhs and the chieftains

ISLAMIC REVIEW

were the Kāzīs; that is to say the judges, to whose decisions even the shaikhs and the chieftains had unconditionally to submit. In war, too, the leaders of the tribes were equally independent, unless they chanced at the same time to be their leader in peace-time.

Against their low standard of material culture—if, in respect of the Bedouins, we may use the word at all in its modern European sense—the poetical power of the Arab stands out all the more clearly. Lyrical, first and last, as is all Semitic poetry, that of the Bedouins affords us a most certain and exact insight into the thought and life which prevailed among them in the ages past. It is true that their circle of poetical similes and pictures is very limited; but how could it have been otherwise in a country not only isolated from the whole of the world, but in itself predominantly a desert? There is nothing of the traditional poetical phrase, nor of the conventional, stereotyped, rhetorical flourishes which abound in the later poems of the Orient and, to a certain extent, in the artistic or self-conscious poems of all nations in the most distressing manner. It is this unaffectedness that differentiates the poetry of the ancient Arabs, to its immeasurable advantage, from the ruck of post-Islamic poetry, and it is chiefly on this field of general culture that the Arabs may be regarded as having left their mark. They were, more than anything else, a race of born poets. Even in later periods, the poets of the civilized and cultured countries of the Orient were wont for years to resort to the inhabitants of the Arabian deserts in order to learn from them the poetics, the pure language of Arabia. The same course was followed by those towns which sought above all to implant and foster a sense of nationality in their citizens. They sent their children, even from their birth, to the desert and they left them there during the first few years of infancy—the impressionable years—so that they might be bred and born, as it were, in the pure customs of their forefathers.

The first to collect the poems of the pre-Islamic period was Abū Tammām (805–846), in an anthology known as *Hamāsa*—which, literally translated, means “bravery.” These

EUROPE'S DEBT TO ISLAM

poems have evidently remained in their original condition just as they had preserved themselves in the mouths of the people, so that through them we get a very faithful reflection of the mental and intellectual life, the ideals, and the general way of thinking of the ancient Arabs.

Of the vast importance of the art of poetry among the Arabs, and of the part that it played not only in their everyday life but also in their politics, we have many illuminative examples. There used to take place at all the great annual fairs or markets which were held in Mina, as well as at all those which were held on 'Okāz, poetical contests, lyrical prize-fights. On such occasions the voice of the people or that of the generally acknowledged prize-poets gave the decisions, and the poems which were awarded prizes were inscribed in golden letters on Persian silk and hung¹ in the national temple of the Ka'aba in Mecca; from which circumstance these prize poems, of which seven are known to us, derive their name of *Mu'allaqāt*. No battle was ever begun

¹ Professor Theodor Nöldeke, in his book *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Poesie der Araber*, Hanover, 1864, pp. xvii-xxi, asserts that the story that the prize poems were hung in the Ka'aba is a fiction, and gives the following reasons:

(1) An event of such a national importance is neither mentioned in *Al-azraqī* nor in *Ibn Hishām*.

(2) It does not seem to have been known to *Al-Kalbī* nor to his son.

(3) Nor does any book, nor any history dealing with Mecca, which otherwise take notice of even the minutest detail, have a single word to say on this point.

(4) Both the *Qur-ān* and the *Hadīth* are silent on it. The Prophet must have alluded to it if anything at all of this nature used to take place in Arabia.

(5) *Kitābu 'l-Aghānī* has very little on the subject.

The first person to mention this fiction is the grammarian *Ahmad an-Nahās*. Later, we find it noticed by *Ibn Khaldūn*, iii. 337-338, and *As-Suyūtī*.

It is true, he observes, that it is not an easy matter to explain the real significance of the epithet *Mu'allaqāt*, but even so, we should not accept this fable as true in the face of the silence of such reliable authorities as those given above.

The learned Professor is inclined to believe that the word *Mu'allaqāt* is a synonym of *As-Sumūt* (lit. necklaces), another epithet used to designate the prize poems, although it is not possible to find a parallel to this usage in the Arabic language. He thinks that the most the word could be understood to mean would be "raised to an elevated place owing to preciousness."

ISLAMIC REVIEW

but it was preceded by a poetical challenge and a reply thereto. Nay, such⁷ was the respect in which they were held, that the poets appeared in everyday life as arbitrators in quarrels, and hindered or ended, by their judgments, the wars that would from time to time break out among the tribes. "Thus after a forty years' war when a well in the desert had nearly caused a new quarrel between the tribes of Bakr and Taghlib, 'Amru bin Hind became a judge, both the poets, 'Amru bin Kulthūm and Hārith bin Hilliza, the former selected by the Taghlibites, the latter by the Bakrites, counsels of their tribes," who decided the quarrel (cf. Weil, *Die Poetische Literatur der Araber*). That the poets enjoyed such great respect was due to the fact that they themselves, like all their brethren of the tribes, were brave men. They strove to distinguish themselves in battle with sword and lance with much the same zest as they contended in the battle of words for the poetical prize. Hammer Purgstall rightly observes:—

Threefold virtue is quite especial to the Arab.
Combined in his soul are
Eloquence, generosity and valour.
To him from whose mouth like gold the pure speech flows,
To him from whose hands gold so lightly as water runs,
Whosoever with the lance wide about the sheepfold protects,
A typical example of the Arabian chivalry is he
And of his honours are the songs of the desert full.

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN AND ORPHANS

By C. A. SOORMA

(Continued from the September number, p. 340.)

CHAPTER VI

WOMAN UNDER JUDAISM

ACCORDING to Westermarck, "the Hebrews represented woman as the source of evil and death on earth."

"Of the woman came the beginning of sin, and through

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

her we all die" (Ecclesiasticus xxv. 2: 24. Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 662).

That woman occupied a very inferior status in Hebrew Society is clear, not only from a perusal of the Old Testament, but also the writings of other historians. For instance, Lecky, speaking of the depreciation of the character of woman by Christian ecclesiastics, attributes it to the influence of Judaism. He says:—

"In this tendency we may detect in part the influence of the earlier Jewish writings, in which it is probable that most impartial observers will detect evident traces of the common Oriental depreciation of woman. The custom of purchase-money to the father of the bride was admitted. Polygamy was authorized and practised by the wisest men on an enormous scale. A woman was regarded as the origin of human ills. A period of purification was appointed after the birth of every child; but, by a very significant provision, it was twice as long in the case of a *female* as of a male child. 'The badness of men,' a Jewish writer emphatically declared, 'is better than the goodness of women.' The types of female excellence exhibited in the early period of Jewish history are in general of a low order, and certainly far inferior to those of Roman history or Greek poetry; and the warmest eulogy of a woman in the Old Testament is probably that which was bestowed upon her who, with circumstances of the most aggravated treachery, had murdered the sleeping fugitive who had taken refuge under her roof" (Lecky, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 357).

"By the Jewish law," says Howard, "as it still existed at the dawn of the present era, divorce was the one-sided privilege of man. At most there was only a faint trace of the woman's later right, sanctioned by the Talmud, of demanding a separation. Legally, for the slightest reason, as the school of Hillel justly maintained, the husband could put away the wife by simply handing her a 'get' or a bill of divorce. By the written law only in two cases, for grave misconduct, was he deprived of this power, though in practice there were several ameliorating conditions which tended to put a check upon arbitrary action. Thus, while divorce was a private

ISLAMIC REVIEW

transaction, certain formalities had to be observed in connection with the 'get' which secured the restraining influence of publicity; and in case the wife was unjustly repudiated, the dower, representing the ancient *mohar*, or purchase-price of the bride, had to be paid to her from the husband's property" (Howard, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-14).

Polygamy among Jews continued right up to the twelfth century. "An express prohibition of polygamy was not pronounced until the convening of the Rabbinical Synod at Worms, under the celebrated Rabbi Gershon ben Juda, at the beginning of the eleventh century. Though this prohibition was originally made for the Jews living in Germany and Northern France, it was successively adopted in all European countries. Nevertheless the Jewish Marriage Code retained many provisions which originated at a time when polygamy was still legally in existence" (Mielziner, *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce*, p. 30).

Turning to the influence of Judaism on the Old Testament, we may take but one characteristic example. In 1 Samuel we find that Saul hated David:—

- (a) "And the women answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands" (xviii. 7).
- (b) "And Saul was very wroth, and the saying displeased him; and he said, They have ascribed unto David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed but thousands: and what can he have more but the kingdom?" (xviii. 8).
- (c) "And Saul eyed David from that day and forward" (xviii. 9).
- (d) "And Michal Saul's daughter loved David: and they told Saul, and the thing pleased him" (xviii. 20).
- (e) "And Saul said, *I will give him her, that she may be a snare to him*, and that the hand of the Philistines may be against him. Wherefore Saul said to David, Thou shalt this day be my son-in-law in the one of the twain" (xviii. 21).

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

What a poor conception of parental love ! What a degradation for woman ! Saul, a patriarch, firmly believed that his own daughter Michal, who was a good woman herself, could be a snare for a righteous man like David, who was a man after God's own heart. But such is the Jewish temperament that it did not until very recent times tolerate for woman a more generous and charitable status than the one to which she has been subjected by the Old Testament.

CHAPTER VII

WOMAN UNDER CHRISTIANITY

Turning our attention to the position of woman under Christianity, we are amazed to find the deep injustice under which she has been suffering since the time of the Master. The present status of woman in *Christian* countries in the West has not been achieved by *Christian* reformers, but by social and political thinkers who, realizing the iniquities of the situation, have swept aside the Biblical notions of the inferiority of woman to man.

We shall begin this argument by depicting the story of the fall of man, as given in the Bible.

- (a) " And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel " (Gen. iii. 15).
- (b) " Unto the woman He said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; *and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee* " (Gen. iii. 16).
- (c) " And unto Adam He said, *Because thou has hearkened unto the voice of thy wife*, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I command thee saying, thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shall thou eat of it all the days of thy life " (Gen. iii. 17).

Again, while discussing the relative importance of the sexes, the Bible says:—

ISLAMIC REVIEW

- (a) " For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man " (1 Cor. xi. 8).
- (b) " Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man " (1 Cor. xi. 9).
- (c) " For this cause *ought the woman to have power on her head*, because of the angels " (1 Cor. xi. 10).

In the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Timothy we again find the following:—

- (a) " I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting " (1 Tim. ii. 8).
- (b) " In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with *shamefacedness and sobriety*; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array " (1 Tim. ii. 9).
- (c) " Let the women learn in silence with all subjection " (1 Tim. ii. 11).
- (d) " But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence " (1 Tim. ii. 12).
- (e) " For Adam was first formed, and then Eve " (1 Tim. ii. 13).
- (f) " *And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression* " (1 Tim. ii. 14).

Thus Paul, the premier Saint of Christendom, allots to woman a status inferior to that of man. Woman is here made the scapegoat for her as well as Adam's sin. But for Eve, Adam would not have been banished from the Garden of Eden, nor would there have been any necessity for the expiation of the original sin by the subsequent "crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the son of God!" Poor woman! What a world of difference there is in this story and the story as given in the Qur-án. In the latter, as we shall see very soon, the fall of man was due, not solely to the weakness of Eve, but to the weakness of *both* Adam and Eve. Both were transgressors, and both suffered.

ISLAM'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN

Westermarck, commenting on this story, says:—

“Tertullian maintains that a woman should go about in humble garb, mourning and repentant, in order to expiate that which she derives from Eve, the ignominy of the first sin and the odium attaching to her as the cause of human perdition. ‘Do you know that you are each an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age; the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the Devil’s gateway; you are the unseater of that forbidden tree, you are the first deserter of the divine law, you are she who persuaded him whom the Devil was not valiant enough to attack; you destroyed so easily God’s image, Man. On account of your desert—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die’” (Westermarck, *op. cit.*, pp. 662–3).

This is strong language indeed, but that woman was unfairly denounced and horribly persecuted during the early days of Christianity is amply clear. For instance, Lecky says:—

“The combined influence of the Jewish writings, and of that ascetic feeling which treated women as the chief source of temptation to man, was shown in those fierce invectives against this sex which form so conspicuous and so grotesque a portion of the writings of the Fathers and which contrasts so curiously with the adulation bestowed upon particular members of the sex. Woman was represented as the door of hell, as the mother of all human ills. She should be ashamed at the very thought that she is a woman. She should live in continual penance, on account of the curses she has brought upon the world. She should be ashamed of her dress, for it is the memorial of her fall. She should be especially ashamed of her beauty, for it is the most potent instrument of the daemon. Physical beauty was indeed perpetually the theme of ecclesiastical denunciations, though one singular exception seems to have been made; for it has been observed that in the Middle Ages the personal beauty of the bishops was continually noticed upon their tombs. Women were forbidden by a Provincial Council (a Council of Auxere, A.D. 578) in the sixth century, on account of their impurity, to receive the Eucharist into

their naked hands. Their essentially subordinate position was continually maintained " (Lecky, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-8).

At the Council of Macon, towards the end of the sixth century, a bishop vehemently denied that woman even belonged to the human species! (Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 663).

Poor woman! Had Jesus Christ lived to hear these ignoble sentiments, he would have been horrified and shocked. The life of Christ abundantly proves that he had all the manly qualities of modesty and chivalry which have been the birth-right of all the Prophets. I consider him to be of the same type and class as the Prophet Muhammad. The religion which claims to-day to be "Christianity" is certainly not the religion taught by the Nazarene. Jesus had the profoundest respect and love for his mother, the Virgin Mary. Naturally, he respected all women, which can best be illustrated by the protection which he gave to the woman taken in sin who was being persecuted by the Jews. Christ, a model man, never degraded woman. To say that he did is a blasphemy and a lie. But there is certainly a great deal of truth in the statement that his disciples and those that came after him claiming to be savants and saints of the Church *did* degrade woman, and denied to her her rightful place in the social scheme. Throughout the ages, until very recent times, the Church has heaped insult and suffering on the head of poor woman. Her emancipation in the West has been achieved, as stated above, by courageous social reformers who had to destroy the Biblical myth of the inferiority of woman to man. How far Muhammad was in advance of these reformers will be clear when we come to the status of woman in Islam.

(Copyright by the Author.)

Friday Prayer and Sermon.—At the London Muslim Prayer House —111, Campden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London—every Friday at 1 p.m. **Sunday Lectures** at 5 p.m. **Qur-án and Arabic, Classes**—every Sunday at 3.30 p.m. **Service, Sermon, and Lectures** every Sunday at the Mosque, Woking, at 3.15 p.m. Every Friday at 1 p.m.



"I have studied many different religious faiths, but Islamic teaching impresses me more than any, for it teaches that no man is so great as God, our Creator ; while other faiths have saints, people born of flesh, whom they worship or pray to . . . and the Bible has been changed and rechanged so often to suit the Christian Roman Church that it is hard to believe in its truthfulness."

H. P. HANBACK.